

REMARKS

Responsive to the requirement of restriction, applicant elects to prosecute the Group II claims, 4-10 and 12-15. The remaining claims have been withdrawn.

Claims 4-10 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. It is the Examiner's position that the specification fails to adequately disclose the structure corresponding to "means for locking said bowl to said manifold".

The Examiner's attention is called to page 5, lines 10-22 wherein it is disclosed that rotation of the ring 18 drives the cartridge 16 into affirmative contact with the manifold 12 to effect sealing with O-rings 11 and 13. In addition, it is disclosed that the cartridge 16 is connected to bowl 14 by flanges 15 on key 30 that mate with slots 32 in collar 34. In addition, it is disclosed at page 4, lines 16-17 that the filtration cartridge and bowl are constructed so that they are sealed to the manifold or removed from contact with the manifold as one piece. Applicant's present amendment is based on this disclosure in the original specification. Accordingly, it is submitted that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-10 and 12 -15 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. It is the Examiner's position that it is unclear as to what structure the "means for locking said bowl to said manifold" implies. The Examiner's attention is called to applicant's discussion above with reference to the rejection based on 35 USC 112, first paragraph. For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this language particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject applicant regards as the invention.

The language of line 3, claim 4 is regarded by the Examiner as unclear since a "passageway" is a space and cannot have an "outside surface". Claim 4

has been amended to recite a wall of a passageway. It is submitted that this amendment clarifies the claim language.

It is also the Examiner's position that in Claim 10, "said collar" lacks antecedence with respect to Claims 4 and 5. Claim 10 has been amended to delete reference to Claims 4 and 5. Accordingly, it is submitted that this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) over Ardes.

Applicant's invention comprises a filtration module including a filter cartridge converted to a bowl so that the filter cartridge and bowl can be connected to and detached from a manifold as one piece. In addition, applicant's invention includes a removable key structure for connecting the filter cartridge and bowl so that the key structure can be reused when replacing a used filter cartridge.

Ardes discloses a fluid filter construction which includes a filter 4, a filter housing 2, and a cap 3. The Examiner identifies filter housing 2 as a "manifold" and cap 3 as a "bowl".

In addition to the above, Ardes includes a fitting 12 which is secured to "central component" 6. The fitting 12 functions to effect anti rotational clamping on central component 6. When the clamping force between fitting 12 and central component 6 is exceeded, filter 4 can be removed from the interior of filter housing (manifold) 2 after cap (bowl) 3 is removed from filter housing manifold 2. In no instance is filter 4 moved as one piece either with the filter housing (manifold)2 on the cap (bowl)3. In Ardes' design, only the "central component" 6 and the filter move as one piece. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims define patentable subject matter and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

R. Stockbower
Serial No. 10/509,499
Amendment

Page ten

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Paul J. Cook

Registration No. 20,820

Attorney for Applicant

Entegris, Inc.

129 Concord Street

Billerica, MA 01821-4600

Tel. (978) 436-6582

Fax (978) 436-6739